1		·
2		
3		TESTIMONY OF A. R. WATTS
4		FOR
5 6		
7		THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA
8 9		DOCKET NO. 2002-1-E
10 11 12		IN RE: CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
13		DYIGINESS AND
14	Q.	WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND
15		OCCUPATION?
16	A.	A. R. Watts, 101 Executive Center Drive, Columbia, South Carolina. I am
17		employed by the Public Service Commission of South Carolina, Utilities
18		Department, as Chief of Electric.
19	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND
20		EXPERIENCE.
21	A.	I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from the University of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. I was employed at that time by
22		University of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. Twis Conference of South Carolina in 1976. Twis Carolina in 1976.
23		promoted to Chief of the Electric Department in August 1981. I have been in my
24		current position since October 1999. I have attended professional seminars relating
25		to Electric Utility Rate Design, and have testified before this Commission in
26		conjunction with fuel clause, complaint, territorial assignment, Siting Act, and
27		general rate proceedings.
28	0	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS
29	Q.	PROCEEDING?
30	Α.	The purpose of my testimony is to summarize Staff's findings as set forth in the
32	73.	Utilities Department's portion of the Staff Report.
		-

27

28

29

30

	1681	IIIOHY OF A. R. Wates Docket 110. 2001.
1	Q.	MR. WATTS, WHAT SPECIFIC AREAS WERE ENCOMPASSED BY
2		STAFF'S EXAMINATION?
3	A.	The Utilities Department's examination of the Company's fuel operations
4		consisted of a review of the Company's monthly operating reports, review of the
5		currently approved Adjustment for Fuel Costs Rider, and review of the Company's
6		short-term projections of kilowatt-hour sales and fuel requirements.
7	Q.	DID STAFF EXAMINE THE COMPANY'S PLANT OPERATIONS FOR
8		THE PERIOD?
9	A.	Yes, we reviewed the Company's operation of its generating facilities, including
10		special attention to the nuclear plant operations, to determine if the Company made
11		every reasonable effort to minimize fuel costs.
12	Q.	HAVE YOU DETERMINED THAT ANY SITUATIONS, IN THE REVIEW
13		PERIOD, WARRANT DETERMINATION THAT THE COMPANY ACTED
14		UNREASONABLY IN OPERATING ITS FACILITIES WHICH COULD
15		RESULT IN ITS CUSTOMERS BEING SUBJECT TO PAYING HIGHER
16		FUEL COSTS?
17	A.	No. The Company's generating facilities, particularly the four nuclear units,
18		operated very well during the period under review. These nuclear units averaged
19		88.9% actual capacity factor for the period. This was achieved even though the
20		system experienced refueling outages at three of the four nuclear units during this
21		review period as well as steam generator replacement at the Harris plant. The major
22		fossil units averaged over 95% availability for the majority of the period under
23		review as indicated on Utilities Department Exhibit No. 1.
24	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR CALCULATION OF THE BASE RATE FUEL
25		COMPONENT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING MARCH 2003.
26	Α.	Staff utilized the projected sales and fuel costs for the twelve months ending March

2003 and included the under-recovered balance of \$9,906,921 as of December 2001

balance to account for the Commission's previously approved amortization by Order

No. 2000-0299 dated March 31, 2000. This calculation produced a factor of 1.485

from Audit Exhibit G. We then removed \$2,224,165 from the under-recovered

1		cents per kilowatt-hour that would be necessary, for the Company to recover
2	-	virtually all its anticipated and booked fuel expenses, excluding the previously
3		amortized portion. The major difference between Staff's calculated factor and the
4		Company's proposed base fuel component of 1.490 cents per kilowatt-hour is due to
5		the Audit Staff adjustment to fuel costs of \$435,144. The results of these calculations
6		for various fuel base components are shown on Utilities Department Exhibit No. 10.
7	Q.	WOULD YOU BRIEFLY EXPLAIN THE REMAINING UTILITIES
8		DEPARTMENT'S EXHIBITS?
9	A.	Exhibit No. 2 shows the Company's Unit Outages for the months of January 2001
10		through December 2001, listing the plants by unit, duration of the outage, reason for
11		the outage and corrective action taken. Exhibit No. 3 lists the Company's
12		percentage Generation Mix by fossil, nuclear, and hydro for calendar year 2001.
13		Exhibit No. 4 reflects the Company's major plants by name, type of fuel used,
14		average fuel cost in cents per KWH to operate, and total megawatt-hours generated
15		for the twelve months ending December 2001. Exhibit No. 5 shows a comparison
16		of the Company's original retail megawatt-hour estimated sales to the actual sales
17		for the period under review. Exhibit No. 6 is a comparison of the original fuel factor
18		projections to the factors actually experienced for the twelve months ending
19		December 2001. Exhibit No. 7 is a graphical representation of the data in Exhibit
20		No. 6. Exhibit No. 8 is the Company's currently approved Retail Adjustment for
21		Fuel Costs Rider. Exhibit No. 9 is a history of the cumulative recovery account.

- 22 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
- 23 A. Yes, it does.

Volume 1 of 1

Mr. Watts, do you have a summary of your 1 0 [Ms. Belser] 2 testimony? 3 Α Yes, I do. Would you give it at this time, please? 4 5 The Utilities Department's examination of the Α Company's fuel operations consisted of review of the 6 7 Company's monthly operating reports, review of the 8 currently approved Adjustment for Fuel Cost Rider, and 9 review of the Company's short term projections of 10 kilowatt-hour sales and fuel requirements. 11 Staff reviewed the Company's operation of its 12 generating facilities, including special attention to the 13 nuclear plant operations, to determine if the Company 14 made every reasonable effort to minimize fuel costs. 15 Staff's review found no situations that warranted a 16 determination that the Company had acted unreasonably in 17 operating its facilities and thereby causing its 18 customers to be subject to paying higher fuel costs. The 19 Company's generating facilities, particularly the four 20 nuclear units, operated very well during the period under 21 The nuclear units averaged 88.9% actual capacity 22 factor for the period. This was achieved even though the 23 system experienced refueling outages at three of the four 24 nuclear units during the review period. In addition, the

refueling outage at the Harris Plant was accompanied by the replacement of the steam generator. The major fossil units averaged over 95% availability for the majority of the period under review as indicated on the Utilities

Department Exhibit #1.

In calculating the base fuel component for the period, Staff utilized projected sales and fuel cost for the twelve months ending March 2003, and included the under-recovery balance of \$9,906,921 as of December 2001, from Audit Exhibit G. We then removed \$2,224,165 from the under-recovery balance to account for the Commission's previously approved amortization of a certain dollar amount over a four-year period. This calculation produced a factor of 1.485 cents per kilowatt-hour, it would be necessary for the Company to recover virtually all of its anticipated and booked fuel expenses, excluding the previously amortized portion.

The major difference between Staff's calculated factor and the Company's proposed base fuel factor of 1.490 cents per kilowatt-hour is due to the Audit Staff's adjustment to fuel cost of \$435,144. The results of these calculations for the various fuel base components are shown on the Utilities Department Exhibit #10.

Does this conclude your summary?

1	A	Yes, it does.
2		MS. BELSER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Watts
3		is available for questioning.
4		CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: Mr. Elam?
5		MR. ELAM: No questions, Mr.
6		Chairman.
7		CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: Mr. Austin?
8		MR. AUSTIN: No questions.
9		CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: Commissioners?
10	EXAM	INATION BY COMMISSIONER ATKINS:
11	Q	Mr. Watts, how are you?
12	A	Fine.
13	Q	Can you help point me — and it may not just be in here —
14		but in any of your tables where we can find out what
15		percentage of the generation for a month or for the year
16		and the load that was met and how much of that comprised
17		by purchases?
18	A	Not in anything that I have in here, no, sir.
19	Q	Okay. But we could do that from the statistics that we
20		have available?
21	A	I believe we can, yes, sir.
22	Q	Okay. Thank you.
23		CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: Ms. Belser?
24		MS. BELSER: Nothing further, Mr.

1	Chairman.
2	CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: You may step
3	down.
4	MS. BELSER: Mr. Chairman that
5	concludes the Staff's presentation.
6	MR. AUSTIN: Mr. Chairman, we'd like
7	to recall Mr. Penny to the stand to clear
8	up some answer that he had that has
9	created a little bit of confusion.
10	CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: Okay.
11	
12	WHEREUPON: RONALD R. PENNY, HAVING
13	BEEN PREVIOUSLY DULY SWORN, RESUMES THE
14	STAND AND TESTIFIES AS FOLLOWS:
15	
16	RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. AUSTIN:
17	Q Mr. Penny, Mr. Elam asked you a question concerning the
18	purchased power invoices. Do you recall that question?
19	A Yes, sir, I do.
20	Q I believe that the answer you gave may have been a little
21	bit confusing and I want to ask Mr. Elam if he would
22	redirect the question to you.
23	CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: Mr. Penny, you're
24	still under oath.
	·

Volume 1 of 1

1 RE-CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. ELAM; 2 Okay, Mr. Penny, let's go about it this way perhaps. Q of these purchased power invoices, can you tell me 3 4 generally what one of those looks like? What is reported 5 to you on one of these invoices? 6 It's been a while since I've reviewed actual invoices, 7 Mr. Elam, but many, most of them break down components of fuel, total energy, and a capacity and a total bill, 8 9 along with some other information. But those are the 10 pertinent information for this. 11 Okay. Do all those invoices have a broken out fuel cost? 12 The specific fuel component — the total energy, yes, but 13 specific fuel component is not identified on each one of 14 You know, since my interpretation of the earlier 15 question went to that component, that was allowed in this 16 Commission, by this Commission, through the Clause, and 17 that was the energy. And certainly the total energy 18 component is shown on every bill. But the specific fuel 19 is not on some merchants. 20 Explain to me the marketer stipulation in North Carolina 21 and how that relates to that energy portion. 22 Α North Carolina's stipulation that historically has been 23 used is a certain percent of the total energy component 24 of various marketers or merchant suppliers, is prorated

1		as the fuel component for the North Carolina Fuel Clause
2		proceeding.
3	Q	Okay. Does CP&L do any kind of proration of the energy
4		portion in its South Carolina Fuel Clause?
5	A	No, it does not.
6	Q	Why would that not be appropriate?
7	A	In South Carolina the entire energy portion, as long as
8		the cost is below our avoided cost of generating
9		ourselves, is allowed through the Fuel Clause Recovery.
10	Q	In North Carolina CP&L accepted a 60% factor in its last
11		fuel proceeding as the portion of the energy cost that
12		could be attributed to fuel, correct?
13	A	That is correct.
14	Q	Okay.
15		MR. ELAM: I would just ask the
16		Commission to take notice of the CP&L's
17		fuel order in North Carolina for last
18		year, it's Docket No. E-2, sub 784, and
19		the order is dated September 13, 2001.
20		
21		CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: Judicial notice
22		will be taken of that document.
23		MR. ANTHONY: Mr. Chairman, I'd also
24		ask you to take notice that the two

1	statutes of the states with regard to fuel
2	cost recovery are different as well as the
3	Commission's applications and tariffs that
4	implement those statutes are different.
5	
6	CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: Notice will be
7	taken of that, too.
8	Ms. Belser, do you have any further
9	questions for this witness?
10	MS. BELSER: Nothing further.
11	CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: Commissioners, do
12	you — based on what happened? Mr.
13	Atkins, do you have any questions in
14	follow up?
15	COMMISSIONER ATKINS: No, sir. Thank
16	you.
17	CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: Mr. Austin?
18	MR. AUSTIN: We have nothing further,
19	Mr. Chairman.
20	
21	CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: You may step
22	down.
23	Mr. Elam, do you have anything else?
24	

1	MR. ELAM: I don't, Mr. Chairman.
2	Thank you.
3	
4	CHAIRMAN SAUNDERS: If there's
5	nothing else then, we're going to close
6	this proceeding and let you know of our
7	decision as soon as possible.
8	
9	[WHEREUPON: THE HEARING WAS
10	ADJOURNED AT APPROXIMATELY 11:25 A.M.]
11	